



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/401,383 | 09/22/1999 | PEIYA LIU | 99P7817US | 4597 |

7590 12/20/2002

SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
186 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ROMERO, ALMARI DEL CARMEN

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/401,383 | LIU ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Almari Romero | 2176 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 07 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 9/22/99 and Formal Drawings filed on 2/07/00.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, and 12 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The formal drawings filed on 2/07/00 were approved by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 5, 9, 10, 11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5, 9, 10, 11, and 16 recites in the limitations acronyms such as “DSSSL”, “FOD”, “CPS”, these acronyms are not well know in the art and should be defined to overcome this rejection.
6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 recites in the limitations “creating <DefineVAr>s ...” and “creating <CaseExpr> or <IfExpr> ...” these terms are not well know in the art and should be defined to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1, 2, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan (USPN 6,487,566 B1 – filing date: 10/1998) in view of Stechmann et al. (USPN 5,617,528 – issue date: 4/1997).**

Regarding independent claims 1 and 12, Sundaresan discloses:

A system and method for automatic generation of card-based presentation documents from multimedia data comprising:

a presentation style transformer (Sundaresan on col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 15: teaches transformer for specification).

However, Sundaresan does not explicitly disclose “a card-based presentation generator”.

Stechmann et al. (Stechmann) on col. 8, lines 54-65: teaches generate card designs or layouts.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Stechmann into Sundaresan to provide a way to generate card designs as a template for the transformation into language specification in order to increase the flexibility in the layout of card designs.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Sundaresan discloses:

a processor for receiving a card display schema and for processing said card display schema (Stechmann on col. 8, lines 54-65: teaches card designs or layouts for display) to describe meta rules about presentation resources and content variable definitions for a card-based presentation specification (Sundaresan on col. 5, lines 1-7: teaches rules describing the language specification).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Stechmann into Sundaresan to provide a way to display card designs as a template for the transformation into language specification in order to increase the flexibility in the layout of card designs.

9. Claims 3, 5, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan and Stechmann as applied to claims 1, 2, and 12 above, and further in view of Ferrel et al. (USPN 5,907,837 – filing date: 11/1995).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Sundaresan and Stechmann disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described *supra*. However, Sundaresan and Stechmann do not explicitly disclose “a resource generator; and a style proceduralizer”.

Ferrel et al. (Ferrel) on col. 19, line 45 – col. 20, line 23: teaches elements within a document (resource) and template can be in various styles.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ferrel into Sundaresan-Stechmann to provide a way to generate elements within a document and provide templates of various styles in to the card design or layout to enhance the display of a document based on template.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Sundaresan discloses:

wherein said card based presentation generator comprises: a presentation construct mapper (Sundaresan on col. 11, lines 34-62: teaches matching for a built tree) and an FOD converter (Ferrel on col. 19, line 45 – col. 20, line 23: teaches object converter.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ferrel into Sundaresan- Stechmann to provide a way to convert objects within the card design or layout to enhance the display of a document based on template.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Sundaresan discloses:

translating declarative card layout style specifications into procedural card-based presentation specifications (Sundaresan on col. 12, lines 35-54: teaches transformation of specifications) and (Stechmann on col. 8, lines 54-65: teaches card designs or layouts).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Stechmann into Sundaresan-Ferrel to provide a way to generate card designs as a template for the transformation into language specification in order to increase the flexibility in the layout of card designs.

10. **Claims 4, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan, Stechmann, and Ferrel as applied to claims 1-3, 5, and 12-13 above, and further in view of Shimizu et al. (USPN 6,374,271 B1 – filing date: 9/1997).**

Regarding dependent claim 4, Sundaresan, Stechmann, and Ferrel disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described *supra*.

wherein said style proceduralizer comprises: a card-based context tree builder (Sundaresan on col. 11, lines 34-62: teaches tree builder); and a content mapping rule generator (Sundaresan on col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 3: teaches matching performed for a tree).

However, Sundaresan, Stechmann, and Ferrel do not explicitly disclose “a content node path walker”.

Shimizu et al. (Shimizu) on col. 4, lines 2-19 and col. 8, lines 17-19: teaches plurality of nodes and hypertext linking as a path between nodes (walker).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shimizu into Sundaresan-Stechmann-Ferrel to provide a path to walk (linking) between nodes into the building and matching (mapping) of a tree structure to provide sufficient support for navigating and organizing information content of a document structure.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Sundaresan discloses:

wherein translating declarative card layout style specifications comprises the steps of: building a card-based context tree (Sundaresan on col. 11, lines 34-62: teaches building a tree); building context paths (Shimizu on col. 4, lines 2-19 and col. 8, lines 17-19: teaches hypertext linking as paths); and generating a content mapping rule (Sundaresan on col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 3: teaches matching for rule specifications).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shimizu into Sundaresan-Stechmann-Ferrel to provide a path to walk (linking) between nodes into the building and matching (mapping)

of a tree structure to provide sufficient support for navigating and organizing information content of a document structure.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Shimizu discloses:

wherein generating a content mapping rule comprises the steps of: getting a next context path; deciding whether last path; visiting a next node; deciding whether end of path; deciding whether node is visited before; creating a context attribute value; creating <DefineVAr>s for rule mapping; creating <CaseExpr> or <IfExpr> if multiple node types exist; and deciding a node category (Shimizu on col. 4, lines 2-19 and col. 8, lines 17-19: teaches hypertext linking can be used as paths between plurality of nodes).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shimizu into Sundaresan-Stechmann-Ferrel to provide a path to walk (linking) between nodes into the building and matching (mapping) of a tree structure to provide sufficient support for navigating and organizing information content of a document structure.

11. **Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan and Stechmann, and further in view of Ross et al. (USPN 6,026,417 – filing date: 5/1997).**

Regarding independent claim 6, Sundaresan discloses:

A system for automatic generation of card-based presentation documents from multimedia data comprising:

presentation style transformer, providing presentation specification (Sundaresan on col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 15 and col. 12, lines 35-54: teaches transformation of specifications and templates); and

However, Sundaresan does not explicitly disclose “card display schema”.

Stechmann on col. 8, lines 54-65: teaches card designs or layouts for display.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Stechmann into Sundaresan to provide a way to display card designs as a template for the transformation into language specification in order to increase the flexibility in the layout of card designs.

However, Sundaresan and Stechmann do not explicitly disclose “providing formatting object descriptions”.

Ross et al. (Ross) on col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 15: teaches formatting objects with descriptions.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ross into Sundaresan and Stechmann to provide a way to format objects with descriptions of a transformed template or design which will decrease the time consuming and tedious process of creating a layout of a document.

12. Claims 7, 10-11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan, Stechmann, and Ross as applied to claims 6 and 12 above, and further in view of Ferrel et al. (USPN 5,907,837 – filing date: 11/1995).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Sundaresan, Stechmann, and Ross disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described *supra*. However, Sundaresan, Stechmann, and Ross do not explicitly disclose “resource generator and style proceduralizer”.

Ferrel on col. 19, line 45 – col. 20, line 23: teaches elements within a document (resource) and template can be in various styles.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ferrel into Sundaresan- Stechmann-Ross to provide a way to generate elements within a document and provide templates of various styles in to the card design or layout to enhance the display of a document based on template.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Sundaresan discloses:

wherein said card based presentation generator means comprises: presentation construct mapper (Sundaresan on col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 3: teaches matching performed for a built tree of a document).

providing a card-based document flow object tree (Ross on col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 15: teaches objects of a tree).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ross into Sundaresan and Stechmann to provide objects with descriptions for a tree of a transformed template or design which will decrease the time consuming and tedious process of creating a layout of a document.

However, Sundaresan, Stechmann, and Ross do not explicitly disclose “ FOD converter”.

Ferrel on col. 19, line 45 – col. 20, line 23: teaches object converter.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ferrel into Sundaresan- Stechmann-Ross to provide a way to convert objects within the card design or layout to enhance the display of a document based on template.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Ross discloses:

wherein said card-based document flow object tree comprises: a specification of a sequence of FODfo flow objects (Ross on col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 15: teaches flow of objects in a tree).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ross into Sundaresan-Stechmann-Ferrel to provide objects with descriptions for a tree of a transformed template or design which will decrease the time consuming and tedious process of creating a layout of a document.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Sundaresan discloses:

wherein generating a card based presentation comprises the steps of: mapping CPS constructs into card-based DSSSL style constructs (Sundaresan on col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 3: teaches matching for built tree of a specification); creating card-based document flow object tree; and converting card-based document flow object tree into formatting object descriptions (Ross on col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 15: teaches flow of objects in a tree and formatting objects with descriptions).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Ross into Sundaresan and Stechmann to provide a way to format objects with descriptions of a transformed template or design which will decrease the time consuming and tedious process of creating a layout of a document.

13. **Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundaresan, Stechmann, Ross, and Ferrel as applied to claims 6-7, 10-12, and 16 above, and further in view of Shimizu et al. (USPN 6,374,271 B1 – filing date: 9/1997).**

Regarding dependent claims 8, Sundaresan, Stechmann, Ross, and Ferrel disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described *supra*. However, Sundaresan, Stechmann, Ross, and Ferrel do not explicitly disclose “a content node path walker”.

Shimizu et al. (Shimizu) on col. 4, lines 2-19 and col. 8, lines 17-19: teaches plurality of nodes and hypertext linking as a path between nodes (walker).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shimizu into Sundaresan-Stechmann-Ross-Ferrel to provide a path to walk (linking) between nodes into the building and matching (mapping) of a tree structure to provide sufficient support for navigating and organizing information content of a document structure.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Sundaresan discloses:

wherein said context tree captures content mapping rule context for making an efficient generation process of procedural rule mappings in CPS (Sundaresan on col. 6, line 65 – col. 7, line 3 and col. 11, lines 34-62: teaches matching performed for a built tree of a document with rule specification).

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 5,995,985 – Cai – filed on 5/1995

USPN 6,009,436 – Motoyama et al. – filed on 12/1997

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Romero whose telephone number is (703) 305-5945. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (7:30am - 4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

AR
December 13, 2002



JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER